DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 800 CG 019 283

AUTHOR Wormith, J. Stephen
TITLE The Effects of Incarceration: Myth-Busting in Criminal Justice.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (94th, Washington, DC, August 22-26, 1986).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Correctional Institutions; *Criminology; *Environmental Influences; Foreign Countries; *Prisoners; *Psychological Characteristics; *Social Theories
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

Nowhere is myth more commonplace than in the correctional setting. With its foundation firmly implanted in tradition and folklore, a great deal of prison management is based on intuitive principles. Moreover, the popular theoretical positions concerning the impact of incarceration have been equally intuitive, or at best ideologically based in the liberal humanist tradition of academia. Generally, these positions bemoan the deleterious effects of incarceration. In contrast, the empirical literature presents a much more equivocal view. Numerous studies report no psychological or intellectual deterioration. These studies include the following: (1) a study of prisoners' psychological characteristics in which longer periods of incarceration were associated with lower levels of pathology; (2) a study of self-esteem which illustrated the complexity of the incareration process; and (3) a cross-sectional survey of psychological and attitudinal attributes that show amount of time served was differentially related to prosocial sentiments depending on sentence length. In this debate, questions of effect have been confused with questions of value. When this occurs, reason succumbs to sarcasm and anger. An empirically-based response to the misplaced anger of humanists must be balanced by a rejection of the inevitable embrace offered by corrections administrators. (A seven-page reference list is included). (Author/ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272800

The Effects Of Incarceration: Myth-Busting In Criminal Justice

J. Stephen Wormith
Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada
340 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K1A 0P8
(613) 990-2752

CG 019283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J.S. Wormith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at 94th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at Washington, D.C.: August, 1986

ABSTRACT

Nowhere is myth more commonplace than in the correctional setting. With its foundation firmly implanted in tradition and folklore, a great deal of prison management is based on intuitive principles. Moreover, the popular 'theoretical' positions concerning the impact of incarceration have been equally intuitive, or at best ideologically based in the 'liberal humanist' tradition of academia. Generally, these positions bemoan the deleterious effects of incarceration. In contrast, the empirical literature presents a much more equivocal view. Numerous studies report no psychological or intellectual deterioration. This includes an MMPI study in which longer periods of incarceration were associated with lower levels of pathology, research on self esteme that illustrates the complexity of the incarceration process and a cross-sectional survey of psychological and attitudinal attributes that shows amount of time served is differentially related to prosocial sentiments depending on sentence length.

Finally, the author's deference to an empirically derived analysis of social phenomena and reassesrtion of scientific integrity is presented as a response to those critics who would see him as an 'apologist for the criminal justice system'.

Myth and misconceptions in Criminal Justice

The criminal justice field has long been a hot bed for myths about social behaviour. Specific issues in criminal justice that have been hopelessly enmeshed in emotional debate include the role and effect of capital punishment (Bedau, 1982; Koestler, 1957; Sellin, 1980: Van den Gaag & Conrad, 1983; Veddes & Keg, 1964:), deterrence (Andenaes, 1974; Hagan, 1982; Mansti, 1978; Nagin, 1978; Zimring, 1978), incapacitation (Bulmstein & Nagin, 1978, Wilson, 1975; Vandine, Conrad & Dinitz, 1979) and its derived foci, the 'career criminal' (Gibbons, 1973), and the prediciton of dangerousness (Monahan, 1981; Steadman & Cocozza, 1974), and finally rehabilitation (Bender & Leone, 1984; Martinson, 1974; Smith & Berlin, 1981). Most particularly, the treatment (Palmer, 1975; Quay, 1977) versus the 'by-and-large-nothing-works' debate (Conrad, 1975; Martinson, 1974) consisted of persuasive arguements, brilliant rhetoric, appealing metaphors, and were sadly lacking in objectivity (Gendreau & Ross, 1979) so that conclusions by either side have been said to be based on 'the discovery of probable random events through sheer diligence' (Robinson, 1976).

Because these issues embody the principles of sentencing in our criminal justice system, they touch its very heart and trigger countless arguments about its raison

d'être. Each issue could have been a legitimate topic for an 'on the other hand' symposium. Other obvious examples include the 'great American gun control war' (Bruce-Briggs, 1976) and the myth of social class and criminality debate (Braithwaite, 1981; McCarvey, Gabrvelli, Bentler & Mednick, 1981; Title, Villemez & Smith, 1978). The latest round in the controversy about the etiology of crime was ignited recently by Wilson and Herrnstein's (1985) Crime and Human Nature and the inevitable critiques it generated (Kamin, 1986). Finally, in corrections, the great rehabilitation debate has only been equalled by the incarceration debate, specifically the psychological impact of life in prison.

One can speculate as to why this field has spawned so many myths and so much confusion. Most importantly, as Wilkins (1974) has said 'the subject matter of penology lies somewhere between religion, morals, and politics'. Consequently questions of effect are all too confused with questions of value (Hogarth, 1971). Secondly, it is an area replete with tradition, history and folklore. Moreover, the news media and entertainment industry have ingrained this folklore in the collective North American consciousness. Yet, I submit, that another reason this field has been a spawning ground of myth and assumption is that applied social psychology has not asserted its rightful and responsible position in the social experiment called prison. Filling this void, ideology has prevailed disproportionately over empirical validity (Wormith, 1985).

Perspectives on Incarceration

The study of incarceration is represented primarily by other disciplines and subdisciplines: sociology, criminology, clinical psychology, economics and political science. It is buttressed by a host of views by journalists (Midford, 1974) and social commentators, (Goffman, 1961) autobiographical accounts and participant observers (Cohen & Taylor, 1981). Collectively, they represent a mix of theory, ideology, empirical data, and personal anecdote.

Perhaps the most well known contribution of social psychology consists of Zimbardo's so-called Stanford experiment (Zimbardo, Haney, Banks & Jaffe, 1975). In reality, the project is more aptly described as an administration of how demand characteristics in the context of unchecked power might lead to abusive interpersonal behaviour (Banuazizi & Mavaedi, 1975). Yet the pervasive interpretation of this work has been that the Keepers and the Kept necessarily constitute an untenable relationship (DeJong, 1975). It has taken a decade for some serious myth-busting of this issue to unfold (Klofus, 1984; Ramirez, 1984).

Social psychology's other well known forray into this area, the prisoners dilemma (Luce & Raffa, 1957), really has nothing to do with the process of incarceration. Although the task of making 'blind' cooperative or individualistic decisions with a non-zero sum pay-off is probably quite

common in prison, systematic exploration with offenders has not been undertaken. Yet incarceration is neither a rare nor trivial event. In the U.S., about half a million people or one in every five hundred are in prison at any one time (Allen & Simonsen, 1986).

In Canada, about 15% of the federal prison population are serving long sentences; that is 21 years to life. With tougher sentencing legislation, we are currently admitting three times as many long term offenders as we are releasing. Therefore, their ratio in the inmate population continues to rise (Wormith, 1984).

Creation of Myth

The picture of prison that has been painted by social scientists and observers has been an austere, oppressive compound of steel bars and concrete, an edifice filled with suicide, violence and homosexual rape. The theoretical view has been equally bleak. It began with Clemmer's (1940) landmark analysis the Prison Community in which he developed the concept of 'prisonization' as the necessary adaptation of a new inmate to the customs of prison society. From this point, two theoretical positions were easily developed, both carrying implicit assumptions about a basic pathology of prisons. Sykes (1958) saw the inmate as suffering the

'pains of imprisonment' because of his deprivation of material, heterosexual and psychological needs and the inevitable frustration that this would create.

Others (Irwin & Cressey, 1962) believed the values, roles, and norms that comprise the prison subculture are imparted by the offender from the criminal world in the community. In sum, the 'importation' view claimed that the personal background characteristics, with which an offender enters prison, predispose him to a particular manner of prison adaptation, while the 'deprivation' position professed that specific prison conditions are responsible for the amount and nature of an offender's prisonization. Regardless, the profound and ubiquitous consequences of these asylums were seen as intellectual deterioration, social isolation, psychological damage, and moral decay. Moreover, the cry that prison is a 'school of crime' has echoed through countless classrooms of criminology.

Perpetuation of Myth

Traditionally in the U.S., when early 'unexpected' findings emerged (Peizer, 1961), they were reinterpreted to conform with expectations (Peizer, 1964) and these misinterpretations have been perpetuated in modern text book summaries of the literature (Fox, 1985). For example, the findings that 'what change there was, took place exclusively

in the area of social adjustment, which improved markedly' is interpreted with another result, a slight deterioration which occurred in personal adjustment or integration. The latter construct was judged to be more important and this raised suspicion about the validity of the former, major findings. The net effect of the study in the literature has been to support the contention that prison causes deterioration among its inhabitants. Hence, it is not surprising to find that blanket condemnations are commonplace in modern text books. 'The damage done by institutionalization is generally in direct relation to the length of incarceration' (Fox, 1985). Typically, these writings cite works like Toch's (1975) personal interviews with 600 prisoners as supporting documentation.

Similarly the psychiatric literature has waxed eloquent on the psychological consequences of long-term inceration. First described by Ganser in 1898 as a 'peculiar hysterical twilight state', the Ganser Syndrome is characterized by the giving of approximate but wrong answers, clouding of consciousness, somatic conversion and subsequent amnesia for previous symptoms (Shorer, 1965). However confusion abounds concerning this psychopathological disorder as evidence about its incidence is scanty and varied (McKay, Jaywardene, & Reedie, 1979). This is partly due to the difficulty in obtaining a precise definition and a standard for

evaluating reported cases. Although most clinicians agree that an independent and identifiable clinical syndrome does exist, they disagree on the symptom pattern, its interpretation, and frequency of occurrence. Recently, DSM-III (American Psychiatric Association, 1980), classified the Ganser Syndrome as a factetious disorder with psychological symptoms under the voluntary control of the patient.

Nonetheless, the Ganser Syndrome is still described in text books as a technical term for what is otherwise known in prison argot as "stircrazy". It is 'apparently a type of neurosis' with no known cure in prison but disappears by letting the person out of prison (Fox, 1985). It is colorfully illustrated by the following, alledgedly true conversation with an inmate who had done 12 years of a 15-30 year sentence.:

Psychologist: What can I do for you?
Joe: Da parole board flopped me.
Psychologist: Why did they flop you?
Joe: Dey didn't tell me why dey flopped me.
Psychologist: What did they say?
Joe: Dey didn't say nuttin'.
Psychologist: Did they give you any clue at all?
Joe: No.
Psychologist: Did they say anything else?
Joe: Yeah, dey told me dat I was associatin' wid bums an' tramps an' no-goods.
Psychologist: They told you that?
Joe: Yeah, dey can't talk about me friends dat way.

Changing View of Current Knowledge

What do we know about the impact of long term incarceration? In 1968, noted British Criminologist Sir Leon Radzinowitz asserted that 'practically nothing is known about the vital subjet of the lasting effects on human personality of long-term imprisonment, yet pronouncements on the subject continue to be made...and very long prison sentences continue to be imposed.' Through the 1970's, the situation began to change, but only slowly because of the 'methodological nightmare' caused by inadequate research designs, unsystematic sampling procedures, poor control comparisons, and disregard for orientation, milieu and security of the setting (MacKay, Jaywardene, & Reedie, 1979).

Yet criminological theories of prisonization do not work for traditional incarceration, let alone long term imprisonment. Only recently has this fact been acknowledged by theoreticians (Thomas, 1977). It seems that proponents of what has been described as the "importation model" and the "deprivation model", have been too busy rebutting one another to critically examine their own position. Furthermore, recent work by Suedfeld illustrates the inadequacy of the deprivation model. Examining the personality, intelligence, mood, stress, and creativity of

inmates in solitary confinement of five North American federal penitentiaries, he found few differences from standardization samples, and concluded that solitary confinement is not universally damaging, aversive, or intolerable (Suedfeld, Ramirez, Deaton, & Baker-Brown, 1982). Indeed, it is not uncommon for incarcerates to request solitary confinement or isolation as a learned strategy for coping with the environment.

Because of this and other findings, conventional wisdom, which once inexorably linked long-term incarceration to deterioration of personality, has undergone a profound change (Flanagan, 1982). This has been due to findings of several investigators where objective tests yielded virtually no convincing evidence that systematic deterioration occurs in any of the physical, psychological, attitudinal or cognitive realms of human functioning. Indeed, there now exists a literature, large enough to command some attention that implies, in some instances, a positive effect of incarceration.

Psychological Deterioration

The complexity of imprisonment and the discrepancy of effects is illustrated most clearly in Bukstel and Kilmann's (1980) review of 90 experimental studies examining the

psychological effects of imprisonment. Their analysis indicated that some prisoners deteriorate in response to confinement, while others show no appreciable change and yet others demonstrate improved functioning. They caution, however, that changes in functioning may also vary according to the phase of the sentence and the time remaining to release, as well as institutional factors such as crowding, prison orientation and peer group affiliation. In sum, each individual responds uniquely to a complex interaction of variables. The diversity of inmate responses to incarceration is illustrated in Irwin's (1981) recent report in which at least 6 different kinds of adaptation and adjustment are reported. His typology of adjustment styles includes the following: community simulation via an active prison socioeconomic lifestyle; accumulation of material possessions; self-improvement along various dimensions such as physical health, education, trade training and skill development, which of course, can be prosocial or antisocial; program resistance or radicalization; and psychological withdrawal from the reality of prison.

The most methodologically sound and convincing studies were done by a group of British researchers. Their research culminated in a longitudinal study of 175 offenders sentenced to at least 10 years and having served from two to eleven years. Subjects were administered a test battery

which was then repeated two years later. The follow-ups revealed no evidence of psychological deterioration. In fact, verbal intelligence showed a significant improvement and hostility decreased over time (Bolton, Smith, Heskin & Banister, 1976). Nonetheless, these results are hotly debated by the study's detractors (Cohen and Tayler, 1981). Other recent studies in German prisons report developments toward conventional attitudes and decreased psychopathology among incarcerates who had served 13 years (Rasch, 1981) and no general personality deterioration after up to 20 years of imprisonment (Bresser & Goeman, 1976).

Aging

In America, social gerontologists have used prison data to debate the importance of social and cultural aspects of aging versus the invariance of chronological age. Reporting on a group of older prisoners, with a median age of 60 and who had served an average of 23 years in a major state penitentiary, Reed and Glamser (1979) found that the traditional experience of aging was not present and prisoners appeared and reported feeling younger than their chronological age. This observation is also made in prisoners' biographies. 'Down here I see guys all the time that are sixty or seventy-five who look like forty to forty-five. Physically they stay younger' (Jackson, 1969).

Suicide

A recent examination of prison deaths is also revealing in that it further challenges some of the common assumptions about prison suicide. The National Centre on Institutions and Alternatives found more than 50% of the suicides occurred within the first 24 hours of imprisonment and 92% had not yet gone to trial. Clearly, the trauma and uncertainty of initial incarceration should not be confused with the effects of long-term imprisonment.

Homosexuality

Homosexuality in prison has long been a source of controversy with much hand-wringing directed to its victims, and pains taken to prevent its occurrence. These positions are a result of popular myths about the incidence of prison homosexuality and homosexual rape. Regrettably, the common view about sex in prison is based on unfounded assumptions and fragmentary research evidence (Allen and Simon 1986). Although there is some evidence for an increase in homosexual rape that is probably related to racial conflict (Scacco, 1979), close examination reveals lower than expected frequency of homosexual contact of which most is between consenting adults, many of whom have had

pre-carceral homosexual experience (Buffum, 1972).

A Positive Effect of Incarceration?

Our own work with federal inmates has produced some quizzical findings on the long-terms impact of prison. Over the course of five years, consecutively admitted prisoners (N = 269) were administered a routine psychological test battery that included the MMPI. Critics of MMPI studies with offenders are referred to Gearing (1979). The prisoners had served an average of 25 months at the time of assessment. There was, however, a wide range of time elapsed since the prisoners' sentences began (SD = 24 months). This permitted an examination of the Time Served dimension. The findings indicate that the inmates who had served more time displayed less deviance on their MMPI profiles. The amount of Time Served at testing was significant and negatively correlated with eight of the ten clinical scales. However, due to the cross-sectional nature of the study, alternative explanations could be suggested. Since sentence length was also inversely related to psychopathology partial correlations were computed. Controlling for the effect of Sentence Length, the Time Served -- Mental Health relationship as maintained. Similarly, Age upon Admission was moderately correlated with psychopathology, younger offenders displaying greater disorder. Again when Age was partialled out of the

correlation, Time Served was still inversely related to Mental Disorder. Furthermore, improvement was not limited to the MMPI. Long serving prisoners also expressed more prosocial attitudes toward the criminal justice system and displayed more socially and psychologically adjusted profiles on the California Psychological Inventory. There was, however, no effect of Time Served on intelligence as measured by the WAIS.

The data were further analyzed to examine whether the relationship was due to promixity of expected discharge, and not simply due to absolute amount of time served and there was no relationship whatsoever between <u>percent</u> of Time Served and psychopathology on the MMPI. Finally, the contribution of prisoners serving life sentences to the relationship was examined. This analysis was carried out because of the prison folklore that "lifers" represent the most stable element of the prison culture and one could expect them to have the most stable element of the prison culture and one could expect them to have served more time. Controlling for time served, lifers did not differ on any of the MMPI scales from prisoners serving fixed sentences. Therefore, their inclusion in the sample could not account for the results.

Self-esteem: Unravelling a confused construct

The study of self-esteem in prison illustrates both the confusion and complexity of prison research. The area is notorious for its contradictory results (Bukstel & Kilmour 1980, Newton, 1980), effects over time having being described as increasing (Bennett, 1974, Gendreau, Gibson, Gurridge and Hug, 1973), decreasing (Fichtler, Zimmermann & Moore, 1973; Hepburn & Stratton, 1977), not changing at all (Atchley & McCabe, 1969, Calbertson, 1975), U-shaped, inverted U-shaped, and even reversed J-shaped (McKay, Jaywardene & Reedie, 1978). More importantly, what is the meaning of the self-esteem construct as it applies to offenders and what is the significance of its change?

We have found that increases in self-esteem, presumably a positive attribute, during incarceration are positively correlated with recidivism in post-release behaviour over a three year period. Another finding, that an increased sense of inadequacy during imprisonment was related to post-release success, provided a clue as to how these results might be unravelled. Indeed, knowing what we do about the incarceration process, one might expect those who develop greater self-esteem in the prison environment would actually be at greater risk for recidivism. Therefore, when the data were reanalyzed, looking concomitantly at how

offenders changed in terms of their criminal orientation, a rather dramatic and revealing picture unfolded. Those offenders whose increase in self-esteem occurred in conjunction with an increase in criminal orientation experienced the most frequent and severe recidivism (Wormith, 1984b).

These findings help to make sense of Goodstein's (1979) study which indicated that inmates who adjust most successfully to a prison environment actually encountered the most difficuty making the transition from institutional life to freedom, while those who adjusted least to the federal institutional culture made the smoothest transition to community life. Indeed, it now appears that self-esteem should be regarded as a double-edged sword because, at least for prisoners, so much depends on the context of its acquisition. This study also illustrates the complexity and some of the nuances that must be considered in examining prisoner change.

Cross-sectional Survey

In a cross-sectional attempt to specifically examine the effects of long-term incarceration, we have recently interviewed and tested a stratified random sample of 634 male offenders in Canada, about 6% of the federal prison population (Wormith, 1985b). Groups were stratified on two dimensions, sentence length and time served. Data were

collected on a wide range of psychometrics, self-report, and officially documentated variables, and a number of general themes have emerged.

Sentence length was not related to race, marital status, socio-economic status, nor the ease with which inmates got along with one another. Although security level was related to sentence length (those with longer sentences being in higher security), it was not related to time served. As expected, age was related to time served, long term offenders who had served more than 8 years were indeed older (about 7 years) than those in the early stages of their sentence. Since aging is an unavoidable consequence of incarceration, no particular attempt was made to control or adjust for the influence of age at this level of analysis. Among recently admitted offenders, long termers were about 4 years older than short-termers.

Pschometric results indicated that long term offenders are more prosocial upon their admission to prison than short term offenders. Secondly, amount of time served was differentially related to prosocial sentiments depending on sentence length. Long-term offenders displayed a U-shaped function, while short term offenders became more antisocial on scales such as Attitude toward the Criminal Justice System (alpha =.91) and Tolerence for Law Violation (alpha = .81).

Insert Figure 1

On a series of self-report (anger) and behavioural (discipline record) measures, short-term offenders (those serving less than 4 years) and intermediate length offenders (4 to 8 year sentences) who had completed at least half of their sentence appear most problematic in terms of disciplinary incidents in the penitentiary.

Insert Figure 2, 3 and 4

Some evidence was found to illustrate long-term offenders' deteriorating community relationships over time. However, they also appeared to make more use of institutional opportunities such as education, clubs and groups and this may be an important factor in their long term successful adaptation to prison life. These findings are not unlike those of McKenzie and Goodstein (1985) who found long termers cope increasingly well with prison over time, regardless of their pre-incarceration criminal history.

Insert Figure 5

Reconciling Anecdote

One should not conceal the fact that there is a striking discrepancy between personal accounts of life in prison (Franklin, 1978) and the data-based research describing it (McKay, Jaywardene & Reedie, 1979). From within, writers as diverse as Jack Abbott (1981), Caryl Chessman (1954), Jimmy Hoffa (1972), Henry David Thoreau (1849), Jack London (1915), Eldridge Cleaver (1969), Chuck Colson (1976), Rubin 'Hurricane' Carter (1974), Timothy Leary (1971), Gordon Liddy (1980), and Alexander Solzhenitsyn (1968) have all presented compelling and persuasive experiential descriptions of prison. Is this simply the inevitable consequence of the captive describing the captors and their behaviour? Or does writing in prison serve primarily a cathartic function? Yet others have written with equal eloquence as outsiders (Goffman, 1961) or by means of participant observation (Cohen & Taylor, 1981).

Certainly anecdotal reports can be found to support any hypothesis. This is illustrated by social critic, editorialist, and part-time cartoonist, Gary Trudeau, in a recent Doonesbury strip about the Meese Commission on

pornography (June 27, 1986) 'Yes, sir. I'm afraid your porno commission's report has met with widespread hooting. No one seems to think the data linking sexual materials to violence is even remotely credible'. Reply: 'No problem'. The President doesn't like data anyway. What he wanted was anecdotes and now he's got some beauts." The same can be said for incarceration. For every prisoner who descends in the Belly of the Beast (Abbott, 1981), another long term offender flies up and becomes a Bird Man of Alcatraz (Gaddis, 1955).

Certainly, there can be, indeed are, deleterious effects of lengthy imprisonment. A single suicide, or self-mutilation is tragic, whenever it occurs, regardless of its incidence or base-rate. Psychologists must be careful not to omit the psychology of rare events. Yet to claim these are straightforward and inevitable consequences of long-term incarceration is simplistic, if not erroneous, and will only divert us from the truly important questions: What are the specific, adverse effects of incarceration? Who will experience them? What environmental and interpersonal situations will produce them? And how can we ameliorate them (Wormith & Porporino, 1984)?

The Diversity of Prison

Greater understanding of prison will only be achieved by looking at the multitude of environments that are found in prison (Bonta & Gendreau, 1986). For example, studies of

death row in the U.S.A., which by the end of 1984 housed over 1400 prisoners (United States, 1986), give evidence of both permanent psychological impact and transitory effects that disappear upon commutation and transfer into the general inmate population (Dahlstrom, Panton, Bain & Dahlstrom, 1986; Gallemore & Panton, 1972; Panton, 1978). Studies of solitary confinement show that certain periods of isolation do not produce perceptual distortions (Gendreau, Horton, Hooper, Freedman, Wilde & Scott, 1968), intellectual confusion (Suedfeld, 1975, 1980), physiological stress (Ecclestone, Gendreau & Knox, 1974), neurological abnormalities (Gendreay, Freedman, Wilde & Scott, 1972) or personality deterioration (Weinberg, 1967), and can be beneficial for clinically selected offfenders (Suedfeld & Roy, 1975). Yet it continues to be admonished as the 'most individually destructive, physiologically crippling and socially alienating experience that would conceivably exist within the boarders of the country' (Jackson, 1983) and so the debate rages on (Gendreau & Bonta, 1984).

Protective custody (PC) is another prison environment which, itself, can have a multitide of forms (Gendreau, Tellier, & Wormith, 1985). Recently, we have found self-reported indicators of heightened levels of stress and fear in PC, but no indication of mental disorder that cannot be accounted for by pre-incarceration symptomatology (Tellier, Wormith & Gendreau, 1985; Wormith, Gendreau &

Tellier, 1986). Brodsky (1984) has demonstrated that program availability and environmental design can be effective in combatting the added stress and stigma of living in protection. Treating the criminal offender has worked, is working, and will continue to work. Without a doubt, certain treatment methods, with certain offenders, in certain circumstances have been, are, and will continue to be effective in the modification of certain behaviour (Ross & Gendreau, 1980; Smith & Berlin, 1981).

Finally, the impact of long term incarceration coupled with the indeterminant sentence, commonly carried out in the name of "preventive detention" deserves special attention (Wormith & Ruhl, 1986). When this combination is applied to a group of sexual offenders who may be psychologically marginal at the outset, a high incidence of psychiatric disorder, but not behavioural and disciplinary problems, appears to emerge in prison. However, one must be cautious when interpreting these results because of the high frequency of psychiatric examinations made on these offenders and the demand characteristics placed on this kind of clinical evaluation.

Fallout and Response

The fallout from this kind of presentation has been substantial (Ciale, 1985; Mohr, 1985a, 1985b) Is Popper's (1959) conceptualization of positivism as the "empty bucket"

theory of induction (Cook, 1985) our only framework? Erroneously, we believe, our empirical approach has been likened to a physician who, while dedicated to the amelioration of suffering, surveys the "just" administration of an execution (Mohr, 1985). Or is it the sin of "Science without humanity" as described by Ghandi? No, it is neither, not when it reflects the diversity, complexity, and subtlety of human nature (Howard, 1985). Moreover, it would be foolhardy, in this day and age, to claim a value-free science (Campbell 1984). What is important is to differentiate the non-epistemic values common to social ideology (McMullin, 1983) from the epistemic values that are crucial to social science (Howard, 1985).

In this debate, questions of effect have been confused with questions of value (Hogarth, 1971). When this occurs reason succumbs to sarcasm and anger (Ciale, 1985; Mohr, 1985). However, an empirically based response to the misplaced anger of our fellow liberal humanists must be balanced by a rejection of the inevitable embrace offered by our colleagues in correctional administration. Such a stance, in essence, is to "walk the razors edge" (Maugham, 1943).

REFERENCES

Abbott, J.H. (1981) In the belly of the beast: Letters from prison. New York: Random House.

Allen, H.E. & Simonsen, C.E. (1986). Corrections in America: An introduction (4th ed). New York: MacMillan.

American Psychological Association (1980). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-III (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Andeas, J. (1974). Punishment and deterrence. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Banuazizi, A. & Moushedi, S. (1975) Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison: A methodological analysis. American Psychologist, 30, 152-160.

Bedau, H.A. (ed.) (1982). The death penalty in America (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bender, B.L. & Leone, B. (Eds.) (1984). Crime and criminals: Opposing views. St. Paul, MN: Greenhaven Press.

Blumstein, A. & Nagin, D. (Eds.) (1978) Deterrence and incapcitation: Estimating the effects of criminal sanctions on crime rates. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Bolten, N., Smith, F.V., Fleskin, K.J. & Banister, P.A. (1976). Psychological Correlates of long term imprisonment. IV - A longtitudinal analysis. British Journal of Criminology, 16, 36-47

Bonta, J. & Gendreau, P. (1986). Re-examining the cruel and unusual punishment of prison life. Unpublished manuscript. Ottawa: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.

Braithewaite, J. (1981). The myth of social class and criminality reconsidered. American Sociological Review, 46, 36-57.

Bresser P.H. (1974) Die Begutachtun zur sozialprognose Lebenslanglicher und Sicherungsverwahrter. Juristisch Rundschau, 7, 265-270.

Brodsky, S. (1984). Inmates in protective custody: First data on emotional consequences. Presidential address, Division 18, American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Toronto, August.

Bruce-Briggs, B. (1976). Great American gun war. Public Interest, 45 (Fall), 36-62.

Buffum, P.C. (1972). Homosexuality in prisons. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bukstel, L.H. & Kilmann, P.R. (1980). Psychological effects of imprisonment on confined individuals. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 469-93.

Campbell, D.T. (1984) Can we be scientific in applied social science?. In R.F. Conner, D.G. Alfman, & C. Jackson (Eds.). Evaluation Studies: Review Annual (Vol. 9.). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Carter, R. (1974) The sixteenth round: From number one to number 45472. New York: Viking Press.

Chessman, C. (1954). Cell 2455, death row. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Ciale, J. (1985) A response to long term incarceration. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 27.

Clear, T.R. & Cole, G.F. (1986). American Corrections. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Cleaver, R. (1969). Soul on ice. London: Cape.

Clemmer, D. (1940). The prison community. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Cohen, J. (1978) The incapacitative effect of imprisonment: A critical review of the literature. In A. Blumstein, J. Cohen, & D. Nagin (Eds.). Deterrence and incapacitation: Estimating the effects of crime sanctions on crime rates. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Cohen S. & Taylor, L. (1981). Psychological survival: The experience of long-term imprisonment (2nd ed.). Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Colson, C. (1976). Born Again. New York: Bantam.

Cook, T.D. (1985) Post positivist critical multiplism. In R.L. Shotland & M.M. Mark (Eds) Social Science and Social Policy, Beverley Hills: Sage.

Conrad, J.P. (1975) We should never have promised a hospital. Federal Probation, 39, 3-9.

Dahlstrom, W.G., Panton, J.H., Bain, K.P., Dahlstrom, L.E. (1986). Utility of the Megargee-Bohn MMPI typological assignments: Study with a sample of death row inmates. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13, 5-17.

DeJong, W. (1975). Another look at Banuazzi and Movahedi's analysis of the Stanford Prison Experiment. American Psychologist, 30, 1013-1015.

Ecclestone, J., Gendreau, P. & Knox, C. (1979). Solitary confinement of prisonsers: An assessment of its effects on inmates' personal constructs and adrenacortical activitiy Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 6, 178-191.

Fox, V. (1985) Introduction to corrections (3rd ed.). Englwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Fishman, J.F. (1934). Sex in prison. New York: National Liberty Press.

Franklin, H.B. (1978) The victim as criminal and artist: Literature from the American prison. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gallenmore, J.L. & Panton, J.H. (1972) Inmate responses to lengthy death row confinement. American Journal of Psychiatry, 129, 167-172.

Gearing, M.L. (1979). The MMPI as a primary differentiator and predictor of behaviour in prison - A methodological critique and review of the recent literature. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 929-963.

Gendreau, P. & Bonta J. (1984) Solitary Confinement is not cruel and unusual punishment: People sometimes are! Canadian Journal of Criminology, 26, 467-478.

Gendreau, P. Freedman, N., Wilde, G.J.S. & Scott, G.D. (1972) Changes in EEG alpha frequency and evoked response latency during solitary confinement. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 79, 54-59.

Gendreau, P., Horton, J.C., Hooper, D.G., Freedman, N., Wilde, G.J.S. & Scott, G.D. (1968). Perceptual deprivation and perceptual skills: Some methodological considerations. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 27, 57-58.

Gendreau, P. & Ross, R.R. (1979) Effective correctional treatment: Bibliotherapy for cynics. Crime and Delinquency, 25, 463-489.

Gendreau, P., Tellier, M-C., & Wormith, J.S. (1985). Protective custody: The emerging crisis within our prisons? Federal Probation, 49, (September) 55-63.

Gibbons, D.C. (1973) Society, crime and criminal careers (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1961) Asylums: essays on the social situations of mental patients and other inmates. Gordon City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

Goodstein, L. (1979) Inmate adjustment to prison and the transition to community life. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16, 246-272.

Hayes, L.M. (1983). And darkness closes in ... and a national study of jail suicides. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 10, 461-484.

Hoffa, J.R. (1972) Prison Life (Phonotape) Enclyclopedia Americana/CBS News Audio Resource Library. 05721.

Hogarth, J. (1971). Sentencing as a Human Process. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Howard, G.S. (1985). The role of values in the science of psychology. American Psychologist, 40, 255-265.

Irwin, J. (1980) Prisons in Turmoil. Boston: Little, Brown.

Irwin, J., & Cresey, D.R. (1962) Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. Social Problems, 10, 142-155.

Jackson, R. (1969) A thief's primer. London: The McMillan Company.

Jackson, M. (1983) Prisoners in isolation: Solitary confinement in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kamin, L.J. (1986) Is crime in the genes? The answer may depend on who chooses what evidence. Scientific American, April, 22-25.

Klofas, J.M. (1984) Reconsidering my prison personnel: New views of the correctional officer sub-culture. International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 28, 169-175.

Koestler, A. (1957) Reflections on hanging. New York: McMillan.

Leary, T. (1971) Jail notes. Lakewood, OH: Douglas Books.

Liddy, G.G. (1980) Will! New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lockwood, D. (1980) Prison sexual violence. New York: Elsevier.

London, J. (1915) The star rover. New York: McMillan.

Luce, R.D. & Raiffa, H. (1957). Genes and decisions: Introduction and critical survey. New York: Wiley.

McCarvey, B., Gabrielli, W.F., Bentler, P.M., & Mednick, S.A. (1981). Rearing social class, education, and immorality: A multiple indicator model. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90, 354-364.

McKay, H.B., Jaywardene, C.H.S., & Reedie, P.B. (1979). The effects of long-term incarceration and a proposed strategy for future research. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.

MacKenzie, D.L. & Goodstein, L. (1985). Long term incarceration impacts and characteristics of long term offenders: An empirical analysis. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 12, 395-414.

McMullin, E. (1983). Values in science. In P.D. Asquith & T. Nickles (Eds.), Proceedings of the 1982 Philosophy of Science Association (Vol. 2, p. 3-23). East Lansing MI: Philosophy of Science Association.

Manski, C.F. (1978) Prospects for inference on deterrence through empirial analysis of individual criminal behaviour. In A. Blumstein, J. Cohen, & D. Nagin (Eds.) Deterence and incapactation: Estimating the effects of criminal sanctions on crime rates. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Martinson, R. (1974) What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, 35, 22-54.

Maugham, W.S. (1943). The razor's edge. Salem, NH: Ayers Company.

Mitford, J. (1974) Kind and usual punishment: The prison business. New York: Vintage Books.

Mohr, J.W. (1985). The long term incarceration issue: The brutality of evil and the pornography of power. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 27, 103-112.

Mohr, J.W. (1985b) Long-term incarceration. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 27, 497-501.

Monahan, J. (1981) Predicting violent behaviour: An assessment of clinical techniques. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Nagin, D. (1978) General deterrence: A review of the empiriccal literature. In A. Blumstein J. Cohen & D. Nagin (Eds.) Deterrence and incapaciation: Estimating the effects of Criminal sanctions on crime rates. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Newton, A. (1980). The effects of imprisonment. Criminal Justice Abstracts, 12(1), 134-151.

Nisbet, R. (1982). Prejudices: A philosophical dictionary. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Palmer, T. (1975) Martinson revisited. Journal of Research In Crime and Delinquency, 1975, 12, 133-152.

Panton, J.H. (1978) Pre and post personality test responses of prison inmates who have had their death sentences commuted to life in prison. Recent Communication on Psychology, Psychiatry and Behaviour, 3, 143-156.

Peizer, S.B. (1960). A study of some basic personality changes incident to the penal incarceration of a group of fifty male-first-felony offenders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Peizer, S.B. (1961) What do prisons do, anyway? Police (November-December) 16, 6-10.

Popper, K. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. London: Hutchinson. (Originally published in German, 1934).

Quay, H.C. (1977) The three faces of evaluation. What can be expected to work. Criminal Justice & Behaviour, 4, 341-354.

Radzinowicz, L. (1968). The regime of long-term prisoners in conditions of maximum security: Report of the Advisory Council of the Penal System. London: HMSO.

Ramirez, J. (1984) Prisonization, staff, and inmates: Is it really about us versus them? Criminal Justice & Behavior, 11, 423-460.

Rasch, W. (1981) The effects of indeterminate detention: A study of men sentenced to life imprisonment. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 4, 417-431.

Reed, M.B. & Glamser, F.D. (1979). Aging in a total institution - the case of older prisoners. Gerontologist, 19, 354-360.

Robinson, J.O. (1976). Book review: The effectiveness of correctional treatment - A survey of treatment evaluation studies by R. Martinson, D. Lipton, & J. Wilks. Crime & Delinquency, 22, 483-486.

Ross, R.R. & Gendreau, P. (1980). Effective correctional treatment. Toronto: Butterworths.

Scacco, A. (1975) Rape in Prison. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Sellin, T. (1961) Pros and cons of capital punishment. Federal Probation, 25 (September), 3-11.

Sellin, T. (1980) The death penalty. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Shah, S. (1978) Dangerousness: A paradigm for exploring some issues in law and psychology. American Psychologist, 33, 224-238.

Shorer, C.E. (1965) The Ganzer Symdrome. British Journal of Criminology, 5, 120-131.

Sloyar, J. A. (1978) Prisonization, friendship and leadership. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Smith, A.B., & Berlin, L. (1981). Treating the criminal offender (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1968). One day in the life of Ivan Denisovich. London: Penguin.

Steadman, H. & Cocozza, J. (1974) Careers of the criminally insane. Lexington, M.A.: Lexington Books.

Suedfeld, P. (1975). The benefits of boredom: Sensory deprivation reconsidered. American Scientist, 63, 60-64.

Suedfeld, P. (1980). Restricted environmental stimulation: Research and clincial applications. New York: Wiley.

Suedfeld, P. & Roy, C. (1975). Using social isolation to change the behaviour of disruptive inmates. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 19, 90-99.

Sykes, F.M. (1958). The society of captives: A study at a maximum security prison. Princeton: Princeton University Press.